

MACEDONIAN CALL

"Come Over into Macedonia and Help Us."—(Acts 16:9.)

Volume 10

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA, JULY, 1936

Number 7

MACEDONIAN CALL

Devoted to the work of establishing and developing New Testament churches.

Published Monthly by

D. A. SOMMER,

918 Congress Avenue,
INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Subscription Price, \$1.00 a Year

Entered as second class matter May 1, 1936, at the post office at Indianapolis, Indiana, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

FORTY BIBLE "IFS"

SEE "IF" YOU CAN FINISH EACH INCOMPLETE SENTENCE

If thou be the Son of God command—
If the blind lead the blind both—
If the salt hath lost its savor—
If ye love them that love you—
If ye forgive not men their trespasses—
If thine eye be single the whole—
If the good man of the house had—
If ye know these things happy are—
If the Son shall make you free ye—
If I bear witness of myself, my—
If you continue in my word, then—
If ye be Christs, then are ye Abrams—
If children then heirs; heirs of God—
If we receive the witness of men—
If we neglect so great salvation—
If our earthly house of this tabernacle—
If we confess our sins he is faithful—
If any man be in Christ Jesus—
If he gain the whole world and—
If any man will come after me—
If it be possible, let this cup pass—
If God be for us who can be—
If there be therefore any consolation—
If ye then be risen with Christ, seek—
If ye do these things ye shall never—
If any man speak let him speak—
If ye be reproached for the name—
If any man suffer as a Christian—
If so be ye have tasted that the—
If the righteous scarcely be saved—
If we say we have fellowship with him—
If we walk in the light as he is in—
If we say that we have no sin—
If then I do that which I would not—
If ye live after the flesh ye shall—
If it be possible as much as lieth in—
If any man teach otherwise and—
If we say that he have not sinned—
If any man offend not in word—
If any man among you seem to be—

A. R. MOORE.

7519 Jefferson St., Kansas City, Mo.

WORSHIP

By E. M. ZERR

The above word and its derivatives occur in the common version of the New Testament some 77 times and require no less than 12 different Greek words to express them in the original. These various Greek words are defined by Thayer who is the accepted authority on definitions for this language as it was used by the inspired writers. The simple word is used as a noun only once and then is not preceded by the definite article. This shows us that the familiar expression "the worship" is not in the N. T., but is solely of human origin and use. And since so much stress has been placed on this term, its absence in the sacred volume is significant. It gives us another instance of the folly of human wisdom in first adopting a humanly coined phrase and then using it in argument in fundamental matters. I shall give a complete list of the Greek words together with Thayer's definition and the references where the words are used. Also, since many of these words are translated by other words besides the one considered in this article, I shall give a list of the various uses which will give the reader opportunity to make a critical study of this important subject.

In Luke 14:10 the word worship is in noun form and is the only place where the word in its simple form is so used. Here it is from DOXA and has been translated in the N. T. by the following words and as often as indicated by numerals following each word. Worship 1, dignity 2, glory 144, honor 6, praise 4, glorious 6. Thayer defines DOXA in the following: "I. opinion, judgment, view. II. opinion, estimate, whether good or bad . . . but, in the sacred writings always, good opinion concerning one, and as resulting from that, praise, honor, glory. III. splendor, brightness . . . magnificence, excellence, preeminence, dignity, grace." From the use and meaning of the word here cited it can be seen that "worship" as used in the N. T. does not necessarily mean the service given to God nor to anything that is always religious in its nature.

The next Greek word is EUSEBEO and has been translated Shew piety 1, worship 1. It is the word for "worship" in Acts 17:23. Here is Thayer's definition: "To act piously or reverently (towards God, one's country, magistrates, relations, and all to whom dutiful regard or reverence is due)."

THERAPEUO. Acts 17:25 has also been translated as follows: Cure 5, heal 38, and is thus defined by the lexicon: "1. to serve, do service. 2. to heal, cure, restore to health." THRESKEIA is the word for "worshipping" in Col. 2:18 and is also translated religion. 3. It is defined "fear of the gods; religious worship, especially external, that which consists in ceremonies." LATREUO is used in Acts 7:24; 24:14; Phil. 3:3; Heb. 10:2, and is rendered Do service 1, serve 16, worship 3, worshiper 1.

Thayer defines it "a. to serve for hire; b. to serve, minister to, either gods or men, and used alike of slaves or freemen; in the N. T. to render religious service or homage, to worship." NEOKOROS is the word for "worshipper" in Acts 19:35 and is not used in any other place. Thayer defines it "1. one who sweeps and cleans a temple. 2. one who has charge of a temple, to keep and adorn it. 3. the worshipper of a deity." PROSKUNTEES is the word for "worshipper" in John 4:23 and the lexicon gives us "a worshipper."

Next we have SEBAZO which is used in Rom. 1:25 and is thus defined: "1. to fear, be afraid. 2. to honor religiously, to worship." SEBOMAI is used in Matt. 15:9; Mark 7:7; Acts 16:14; 18:7, 13; 19:27. It is rendered worship 6, devout 2, devout person 1, religious 1. Defined thus "To revere, to worship." SEBASMA is the word in 2 Thess. 24 and is also used for devotion 1. It is defined by Thayer as follows: "Whatever is religiously honored, an object of worship." THEOSEBES is in John 9:31 and rendered as a worshipper of God. Thayer defines it "worshipping God, pious."

But the word most frequently used for worship is PROSKUNEO, which occurs 59 times and is not translated by any other word anywhere in the N. T. Owing to the frequency of its use I shall not take space in citing the passages where it is used but will give the definition of Thayer. "In the N. T. by kneeling or prostration to do homage (to one) or make obeisance, whether in order to express respect or to make supplication. It is used, a. of homage shown to men of superior rank. b. of homage rendered to God and the ascended Christ, to heavenly beings, and to demons."

I have given the reader a list of all Greek words for worship in the New Testament and definitions from Thayer, likewise shown other words by which many of these words have been translated in our common version. And it should be noted that in all of these various instances, 77 in all, **NOT ONE CASE EXISTS WHERE THE WORD WORSHIP IS USED OF THE SERVICES OF THE CHURCH AS SUCH.** This shows the folly of all the stress that has been laid on "the hour of worship." Also the mistake of saying a thing is "not a part of the worship" just because it does not compose part of the Lord's day communion service. The several occurrences of the word and the different uses and definitions show us that the word "worship" as used in the N. T. covers human action from that of mere respect or honor up to the wholehearted service rendered to God. Hence, when we speak of a thing as to whether it is an act of worship we must consider the context to determine whether it meant an act or attitude of simple respect or a complete devotion to God and Christ.

It is true that while the inspired writers not once use this word in direct connection with the Lord's day communion service, yet the various phases of meanings in the word will allow us to describe this public service as worship. But we are NOT at liberty to say a thing is not a part of the worship just because not a part of this service. And even when we may truthfully say an act is not a part of said service we should make the specification that we refer to this weekly service. An act may be one that is individual only or it may be congregational in its nature. Again, all congregational services are participated in by the members as individuals, but such services as the communion and contribution are established for the members of the congregation and such services cannot

be performed by any individual unless they are done as a member of the congregation. I mean that since these acts of service are congregational, no Christian may perform them in private, apart from a congregation, on the ground that he is to act as an individual any way.

Now the question is raised sometimes whether the teaching and hearing of the Bible in the classes consist of worship. Well, since one meaning of worship is to respect and honor, and since a man who will sit and listen to the teaching of the Word thus shows honor and respect, it may be said that he is worshiping in this case. But it will not admit that stronger definition of the word that means obedience and devotion to God. None but the children of God are invited to do this and promised reward for so doing.

Again, while all acts of honor or respect come within the definitions of the word now under consideration and thus even a worldling may in this way be said to do worship, yet the inspired writers draw a line between the privileges accorded to mankind. For instance, a man of the world is permitted to come to the assembly, take part in the study of the Text, read a verse of scripture when his "turn" comes and do any other such like things even though such may be said to consist in worship in light of above definitions of the word. But the reason he is permitted to do all these is that in so doing he cannot mislead nor falsely teach the hearer and hence can do no harm. But he is not allowed to act as a teacher for in so doing he would be given opportunity to "bring" false doctrine and hence do much harm. The acts of worship here seen to be allowed to those not members of the true body are hereby explained on the broad plane of meanings attached to the word used by the sacred writers, and it is not to be construed in the least as the letting down the bars for those not faithful servants of God. We should keep before the audiences constantly the idea that the congregational services are meant for those only who are members of the congregation although we could scarcely be justified in prohibiting non-members by force. But when it comes to such as these trying to "worship" by teaching, then we **MUST PROHIBIT** them for John 10, 11 commands us to receive him not. **THE BROAD LATITUDE OF THE WORD "WORSHIP" DOES NOT ADMIT THE USE OF A FALSE TEACHER. FOR FALSE TEACHING RENDERS ALL WORSHIP VAIN ACCORDING TO MATTHEW 15:9.**

"THE HOUSE THAT JACK BUILT"

In which a pseudo-argument is analyzed and considered.

By W. CARL KETCHERSIDE

"This is the cow with the crumpled horn, that tossed the dog, that worried the cat, that killed the rat, that ate the cheese, that lay in the house that Jack built." This little sing-song reminder of the First Reader Days, is constantly coming to mind as I read the dolorous ditty now being sung in constant refrain, by the editors of the Apostolic Review. There is no rhythm or reason in either one, but the editors of that periodical seemingly think that they have produced a system of incontrovertible logic, which will justify their free-and-easy compromising with hobbyists, innovators and factionists, of every shade and degree. That the reader may know to what I refer, I offer herewith a few examples.

About a year ago Verna M. Gilbert visited my meetings at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, and I requested him to lead

in prayer. Immediately after the service had closed, I engaged in conversation with him, and he told me that he thought we would all be preaching for the college churches in ten years. I told him that might be true with regard to himself, but it would not be thus with me. I endeavored to explain my position in no uncertain terms. But, shortly afterwards the brotherhood was flooded with postcards sent out by the Review office, telling that "Carl Ketcherside fellowships Gilbert at Cedar Rapids!" What was to be gained, or proven by these cards and the sly reference made to the same in the Review? Presumably that I fellowshiped Gilbert. Gilbert endorsed the Review, the Review published the "Rough Draft"—therefore Carl Ketcherside endorsed the "Rough Draft."

I will not again call upon Gilbert, because since the above mentioned date, he has preached for the "college church" in Topeka, Kansas, and also has endorsed Morris at Camp Center in Iowa. I now know exactly where he stands. But even as I write this, he is holding a meeting for the North Indianapolis church, where the Review forces attend and worship. The A. R. publishers declare that North Indianapolis is not in sympathy with, or fellowshipping the "college idea". But let us use their invincible(?) argument. The North Indianapolis church fellowships Gilbert, Gilbert preached for the "college church" in Topeka, where Utley is pastor; Utly fellowships N. B. Hardeman, Hardeman is president of a Bible college—therefore, the North Indianapolis congregation is a "college church". Out of their own mouths and by their own arguments they are condemned. Remember, "what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander".

Only recently the Review reported that Brother Poer preached at North Indianapolis, and added, "Carl Ketcherside will fellowship Poer at Gadsden where he holds a meeting this fall!" What did they intend to imply by that statement? Evidently that I am to hold a meeting at Gadsden where Poer has membership, Poer preaches at North Indianapolis, North Indianapolis fellowships the Review force, the Review force wrote the Rough Draft creed—therefore if Ketcherside fellowships Poer, he endorses the Rough Draft. Is that correct reasoning? Is my working with Poer at Gadsden equivalent to endorsing the Rough Draft? Poer says not, because when I made a recent visit to the Review office, Poer was there, and declared his opposition to the Rough Draft, in the midst of my very heated discussion with Allan and C. W. Sommer. Of course, I cannot understand how Bro. Poer can preach at North Indianapolis and yet oppose the Rough Draft, because I had an engagement to preach there in a protracted meeting, and when I expressed my opposition to the "modern creed" they refused to permit me to come, and called a man who endorsed the "Rough Draft." But that does not enter into this question. Let us just go on applying the Review's newly-invented measuring stick. Judged by their own standard, where does the Review stand today?

It stands for the college, for "The Review endorses V. M. Gilbert, Gilbert endorses Earl Warren, of Adelphi, Iowa; Earl Warren endorses James Scott, James Scott endorses G. C. Brewer, Brewer endorses the Gospel Advocate, Nashville, Tenn., the Gospel Advocate endorses the 'Bible colleges'—therefore, the Review endorses the 'colleges.'"

The Review stands for the "Pre-millennial heresy," for "The Review endorses Don Carlos Janes, Janes endorses

R. H. Boll, Boll has divided the southern churches over his pre-millennial hobby, so therefore the Review endorses pre-millennial factionism."

By the same method I can prove that the Review has gone over to, and fellowships the Christian church. It's your medicine, boys; you compounded the prescription and you'll have to take it! And in spite of your attempts to keep the North Indianapolis church free from a stigma of "college-ism" your line of reasoning that you have introduced to sustain your fast weakening cause, and to down W. G. Roberts, E. M. Zerr, D. A. Sommer, W. Carl Ketcherside and others, forces that congregation right on into the "college fellowship." Let me repeat to the Review publishers what I said in their presence in the Review office recently, "If it is true that the North Indianapolis church does not want to be recognized as 'college' why don't you follow your advice as given in the Review in 1930? If you want to fellowship the college group, why don't you go where they are, and leave a church alone that does not want to be dragged into your compromising position?"

Paraphrasing the heading of this article, we may safely say in using "The House That Jack Built" argument as developed by the Review editors, when we refer to their publication, "This is the paper all forlorn, that wrote the creed so rough and worn, that led off the preachers, who led off the saints, and divided the Church that Christ built."

NOTES AND COMMENTS

A Betrayal of Our Plea.—The publishers of the Apostolic Review, June 23, p. 13, say: "If we can't worship where the organ is displaced, then we confess all our row over the instrument was false." Is the instrument the only vital difference between us and the Christian Church? The Sand Creek Declaration, made about fifty years ago, by the Sand Creek church (and many other churches) near Windsor, Ill., called attention to the worldliness and many unscriptural things the digressives were practising, and "declared" that because of those things they would no longer fellowship them. Daniel Sommer was the speaker on that occasion when several thousand people were said to be present. From that time the Review began to draw the line on the Christian Church, and to keep their preachers out of our pulpits. The chief fight of the Review for fifty years has been to keep digressive preachers out of our pulpits, and for thirty or forty years one of its chief fights has been to keep the college preachers out. Yet now the publishers fight harder than ever to **undo their work of fifty years.** The pastor system, societies, shows, lack of discipline and many other unscriptural things in the Christian Church, can now be winked at, according to the statement of the Review quoted above. Is the worship of God any more sacred than the work and government which God has provided for His Church? Those who uphold vital errors should not be encouraged. "Receive them not," says John.

What the Collegites Will Do.—In the Review for May 26, the publisher says: "The Christian Leader says our Bible colleges are 'the foundation for the future Church.' But the apostle Paul wrote in Eph. 2:19, 20, '... the household of God ... built upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone.'" Now since every person teaches

and pushes what he believes, if he is in earnest, and since the Bible college preachers believe "the foundation for the future church" is their College, it is evident that they will teach and work to lay this foundation. And the Apostolic Review says it is opposed to these colleges as the "foundation for the future church," yet it is working as hard as it can to let those college preachers in among us, where they will have a chance to teach that the Bible college is "the foundation of the future church." They are handing the collegeites a knife to cut their throat, and the collegeites are doing it.

A Sample of What?—Here is something more from our un-"apostolic" publishers: "After Bro. McCord, whom he terms 'the college preacher' in Indianapolis, accepted his challenge for debate, the M. C. editor refused to run it in his paper."—Review, June 23. Let the reader turn to the Dec.-Jan. number of M. C. for 1935-36, and read my challenge. It called for a "public, oral, courteous investigation in Indianapolis." McCord refused to have such an investigation, but said he would debate in the M. C. ONLY. I consented to have it in the M. C. if he would have it printed also in the Gospel Advocate or Firm Foundation. He never wrote that he would. I told him that he evidently was afraid for his people to hear it. So that was the end of the matter. He would not provide any way by which the college people could hear it or read it. Nobody but a simpleton would submit to such an arrangement. **But he refused to a public, oral debate in Indianapolis.** Yet the Review publishers say he "accepted." That is a sample of their misrepresentation.

Another One.—In the June number of the M. C. I say of our chief perverters of truth, "They indulge much in scathing personalities, flings, misstatements, falsehoods and irrelevant points. These people do not pretend to answer the arguments from the scriptures brought against their position, but nearly altogether stress their subterfuge, 'You are inconsistent, too—you are in the same boat with us.' What if we are? When did two 'inconsistencies' make one consistency?" To this the Review publishes two-thirds of a column of misrepresentation, saying I admitted I was "inconsistent" when I admitted no such thing. The word "inconsistency" is in quotation marks, and shows that I was talking about what he called "inconsistency." The argument was, granting what he said, what if we ARE inconsistent, it has nothing whatever to do with the scripturalness of their practice, which is what is under discussion. What's the matter with those fellows at 904, anyway? Is it downright dishonesty, or are they so mad they can't see straight? Brethren, these are samples of nine-tenths of their misrepresentations. Get your files and read these incidents for yourselves. Don't be surprised if I do not answer any more such, unless it has to do with a passage of God's Word.

A Toy Gun.—And now we come to that toy gun (tomorrow is the Fourth) which the Review has been snapping so constantly with noise but no harm, regarding Bro. Zerr: "Where the worship is scriptural, and where the church as such does not support the colleges and other innovations, one should not refuse to worship with them on account of private opinions." Bro. Zerr has his article in for this issue, which partly handles this, but as the last Review quotes it a number of times, I wish to drop a remark. **It does not have anything to do with the real question which we have been discussing.** The Rough

Draft said: "If the preacher we employ wants to give part of what we give him to aid a human religious society, that's HIS PERSONAL AFFAIR, and—RISK!" This passage shows that the Review taught that it is all right for us to employ college preachers. This doctrine overthrows one of the most important teachings of the Bible—to keep our false teachers. It is on this point that we have chiefly centered our attacks, and Zerr's statement has nothing to do with this. **For brethren to worship with a church which does NOT support the colleges, and other innovations, as a church, is ALTOGETHER DIFFERENT from letting a preacher in to preach for us, who gives money to support these human rival organizations, and talks for them publicly and privately.** The Review's argument is a toy pistol—makes a noise but hits nothing. But here's a shot at them with a real gun, regarding these false teachers—"Receive them NOT." (2 John 10, 11.)

But Why All This "Fussing"?—I rejoice that so many brethren and sisters have courage to stand up and fight for the simplicity in Christ. Yet there are a few timid souls who don't read their Bibles much nor religious papers, and seem to know little about the inroads of the enemy on the true Church of God. Contending for the faith against apostates seems like "fussing" to such. If they would read that old War-book called the Bible, they would see that it is filled with fighting for the right. Paul's epistles abound in it. God's people in all ages have had such conflicts. In the days of the Judges about every generation there was an apostasy from God, and it is true today. But here is a point which has not been made as clear as it should be. While the Rough Draft has led many people away from what they used to believe and from the Bible, many were ready and wished to drift away. Many preachers were anxious for an easier road, and the Rough Draft pointed them to it. That document was simply a means of bringing apostasy to a head. **It was an OCCASION as well as a CAUSE of the present drifting.** Many preachers and elders who have stood behind it are as much to blame. But I rejoice that so many intelligent brethren and sisters have had the courage to stand out against this apostasy, and I hope all the honest ones who have not yet, will soon show their colors. From what brethren have done in this battle, I have the confidence that if Zerr, Carl Ketcherside, D. A. S. or any others should digress from the faith of the Father, they will turn them down just as they have turned down the leaders in this apostasy and their paper. I thank God for such soldiers to fight with, and take courage and go onward.—Publisher.

BE OF THE SAME MIND

The Apostle Paul, in his letter to the brethren at Corinth (when he had learned of their division, by contending, the esteem of persons) said, "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment." Now we know this of Paul, that he did and said nothing to the pleasures of "man." He was zealous to please Christ, and had no other intent in mind but to do His will. He understood that it was to his profit to please Christ and he desired to please Him, "rather than man." How pleasurable, if we had such zeal among all who have professed

Christ. We have this zeal in a remnant, but not universally, for some have erred and gone aside from Christ to please man. * * *

To compromise with sectarianism is a breaking of the commandment that tells us to be spiritually-minded. It also causes division, which is contrary to sound doctrine, and what can it be that can deliver a soul to eternal punishment any sooner than failing to be spiritually minded or cause division? Such is a transgression, and those who deal thusly are sure of a transgressor's reward. Thanks be to the God of Heaven, for those who desire to know nothing save Jesus Christ and Him crucified and are ready at all times to remain LOYAL to the cause.

How pleasant the work would be if instead of compromising and dividing, as has been done and is still being done, the compromising efforts were changed to loyal efforts, combining forces to deliver the truth to sectarians rather than bidding them godspeed. Such a change would be profitable to the brotherhood, and some good rewards that yet exist could be delivered without disappointment to the One who called us to endeavor to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.

We cannot recognize the compromising one, as by so doing he has ceased to be a brother by stepping out of the fold into a "seeming" one. If he desires to be a brother he must remember from whence he has fallen and repent, throw off the worldly yoke, and get back in line. When he has done this in sincerity we are ready to call him brother, but not before.

Compromisers and their sympathizers are in the same danger. **Compromising is division** and the commandment regarding division is found in Romans 16:17. "Now I beseech you brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them." Failing to **avoid them**, we endorse their undoctinal practices, and thus are fallen from the Lord's favor. We should have no desire to be judged with his judgment, but if we fail to avoid him, that's just what will happen. As for myself, and not boasting, I would not endorse any of my kinsmen, regardless of how near, if they were digressives. We commit just as great a sin if we recognize kinsmen in this respect as we would to recognize one outside our family.

It is the duty of all churches everywhere who delight in loyalty to the cause to **know** the one who desires to preach for us. We should without fail investigate every occasion, until we learn whether or not they are loyal. It is no sin to be careful, but it is a sin to carelessly let in a person when we are in doubt, then finally learn when it is too late that we had made a mistake (and promise ourselves "it won't be done again"). But the time to use care is **right now**, even if it causes delay to a certain extent, for it is worth the delay to know a person first and then keep such spaces open to the ones who are loyal and can serve us so much better. Brethren, let me repeat this, keep space only for the use of the loyalists, because they are the **only ones worthy**, and if we don't recognize them with care, **we are not doing our duty**. Our reward hinges on our service, so let's scrutinize our service at all times, and from all angles, and when we serve let's do it right and see to it that we be of the "same mind" and the "same judgment," fearing "One" and favoring none but the steadfast. Yours for cleaner churches.—S. S. RETZER, Jacksonville, Ill.

WHAT ALEXANDER CAMPBELL SAID ABOUT MUTUAL TEACHING

This great religious teacher pleaded for the development of the talent of all the brethren, which some churches of Christ today are trying to drift from. And let me ask here, What is the use of developing the talent if we do not use it in the meetings of the church generally, so that we can send the preacher out into new and weak places? That at least should be one of the main purposes of this development. But here is what Campbell said:

"If, indeed, preachers can not be prepared for want of time to study, why do they [preachers] make a monopoly of teaching: for by attending to Paul's instructions to the churches at Rome, Corinth, Ephesus, and others, it will be seen that **teaching is a thing not to be restricted to an individual of an assembly, but that every man in an assembled body of Christians, possessing in a greater or less degree the gifts for teaching or exhortation, should not be obstructed** [which is not done when we have preaching all the time—D. A. S.], **but allowed the opportunity to exercise the same. But this is not permitted when one man engrosses all, and drinks up, too, the resources of the congregation, which ought to be appropriated to the use of the poor, as Paul enjoins.**"—Christian Baptist, p. 28.

Would it not lead to a great onward movement if we could get all faithful men in the church to develop themselves so they could help make public meetings profitable, and most of them would make their living at some secular calling and for the love of the truth would go out whenever they could to tell the story of Jesus? Then the contributions could be used to help the poor and to preach the Gospel in new and weak fields. Let us all work for such a church, being willing to do our part.

LET THE TRUTH BE KNOWN

We now come to A. M. Morris and the People's Bible Advocate, in which I want to **let the truth be known**.

The Review has already exposed the doctrine they practiced at Long Beach and we have quoted enough of it to suffice. What we have written about him and his part in the Union Meeting in Kansas City shows he now fellowships the Bible College men and walks hand in hand with them. It is with sadness I write these things concerning A. M. Morris, because there was no man in the brotherhood I had been associated with more than he. But I had to break with him when he compromised the scriptures and upheld R. C. Yadon and the faction he led when they by their unscriptural work divided the church at Winfield, Kansas.

R. C. Yadon was engaged to preach part time at Winfield, and spend the other time in Mission work, for which the church supported him, but he took the PASTOR FEVER and he and his followers set about arranging for him to pasture for them in Winfield. They wrote some thirty or more churches in Kansas asking them to contribute to the support of a preacher to be located at their mission point. I wrote to them for our congregation and asked **what they were going to do with Bro. Yadon?** They never answered that question. Had they answered it truthfully, they would have said, "We want you brethren to send money to support a man at our mission point

"Ye cannot serve God and mammon."

so we can have R. C. Yadon preach for us all the time—in other words, pastorate for us, which he did.

One elder and one preacher opposed this, together with a goodly number of the membership of the church. Yadon, who was then the leader, brings charges against this elder, called him to a private meeting in a private home, and instructed him he could have no witnesses. The elder agreed to meet the charges in an open meeting in the church house, but this was denied him. He then ignored their private meeting. They went right on with their private hearing. Yadon was involved in the charges, helps arrange them, sits in judgment on them, deposes the elder and at the same private meeting withdraws their endorsement from the preacher, and do not notify him until three days later. Charges were brought against Yadon and the elders for this work, but they would not come to a hearing nor suffer either one or more evangelists to come to Winfield to hear these charges.

A. M. Morris came to Winfield soon after this division and preached for this faction led by R. C. Yadon and upheld these elders in their work and hence endorsed it. I had a private correspondence with him over it in which I challenged him to meet me in Winfield and affirm the work of Yadon and those elders was scriptural. He has remained silent on it to this day. This was why I broke with A. M. Morris and I now challenge him to prove what I have here stated is not true. Not a loyal man has preached in the meeting house at Winfield since they locked the doors against the loyal brethren. They called a college man to hold a meeting for them soon after that and Yadon went over to the college people and compromised with them. In this case Morris upheld the doctrine that you can't try elders if they don't want to come to a hearing. This is the reverse of his position in 1910, when he upheld Daniel Sommer and T. L. Gray in hearing charges against P. H. Lilley as an elder against his will, and deposing him as elder in the Jamesport congregation at Jamesport, Mo.—J. A. FREED, Topeka, Kans.

A LETTER FROM BRO. PARSONS

Dear Brother Sommer, and all the readers and writers of the Macedonian Call: * * * We need the writings of such men as Zerr, Roberts, Ketcherside and others whose names appear in it. The Review has changed and there is no use for me or any one else to try to deny it any longer. No one has tried harder than I have to avoid this conclusion. But the broad compromising course it has pursued for the last few years has borne fruit that no one who observes carefully can fail to identify as evil fruit. And "By their fruits ye shall know them."

Instead of the strong, sound articles from the pen of such brethren as I have named, we find the writers going out of their way to say things so the Christian Church people and the college brethren will not be the least offended. And then the reports of meetings are quite largely made up of those who for years were identified with the college element, and are yet, except that they will declare they are opposed to it when they can get some work among brethren who oppose it.

In the Bible Reading at Marietta, Ohio, in 1912, Brother Daniel Sommer taught us that these Bible College people are a different kind of people! That was true then, and it is just as true today. Brethren, your new friends that you gain by the sacrifice of old ones will fail you and betray you in time of distress and in time of

need. They are using the same methods that the Christian Church people used twenty-five or thirty years ago. When they once get into possession they will tell you where to go if you don't like their way of doing. How many who read this are willing to stand for the old paths? Don't be afraid, brethren, because many are going in the compromising way. There are a few who are not going with the college element nor the Christian Church, even if they do stop the organ for a little while.—CHESTER G. PARSONS, Malta, O.

TRYING THE SPIRITS (I Jno. 4:21)

In Apostolic Review, May 12, 1936, I read: "Go and hear Roady, Johns, Gilbert, J. M. Horney, Wm. Freeman Jones, D. Sommer and other preachers who report in the Review. If you hear them advocating instrumental music in worship and colleges established to teach religion out of church funds, THEN will be the proper time to doubt their loyalty to the Church. If you don't hear them so advocate, then start to wondering as to THE REAL MOTIVE that drives certain other preachers to slander these brethren and the Review as 'heretics', and even say our baptism and keeping the Lord's Supper are 'compromise.'"

Satan never perpetrated a more deceptive statement than the above. According to the Review manager's logic, the men mentioned can go right on with said managers, working with, upholding, endorsing, encouraging, and urging upon the faithful churches the rankest of college and instrumental-music-in-worship advocates, and still be perfectly loyal, so long as these men do not advocate with their own mouths the mentioned evils.

Will the Review managers name one instance where the above mentioned men were ever accused of advocating church-supported colleges and instrumental music in worship? If so, their criticism is justified. If they cannot name one instance (and they cannot) then their criticism is proven extremely false, deceptive and misleading. (See Rev. 21:8.)—WM. KETCHERSIDE.

REPORTS OF BRETHREN

Brookport, Ill.—The local congregation is getting along nicely. Our attendance yesterday was the best we have had for months.—A. T. Kerr.

Kansas City, Mo.—We need to know Who's Who these days. Looks like it is getting pretty warm for some of the "fence sitters" who pretend to believe one thing and practice another. We are getting along very good at Spruce with our development work. Are also having good attendance at all meetings, with good interest.—R. A. Ditto.

Riverside, Calif.—Bro. Zerr will hold a Bible reading here beginning the first Monday in January, 1938, and Carl Ketcherside will hold a meeting some time in 1938.—Robert Sankey.

St. Louis, Mo.—I am glad beyond expression to witness the utmost consistency with which you cling to the Truth—Robert A. Johnson.

Des Moines, Iowa—The meeting here is moving on. Two confessions to date. We spend one and a half hours each week day, except Saturday, studying the Bible.—W. E. Ballinger.

New Castle, Ind.—Filled my regular appointment with the congregation here June 27, and was greeted by a good sized audience. At conclusion of the morning service Brother D. A. Sommer and wife placed membership with this church. They gave as their reason for this move that they "wished to belong to a congregation that does not endorse the drifting and apostasy now so evident in the brotherhood."—C. R. Turner.

Canalou, Mo.—I spent the week end at Bonne Terre recently with Brother L. E. Ketcherside. Brother Lloyd Riggins had been there in a three weeks' meeting. We certainly did enjoy

the all day meeting at the close of his stay there. Brother Riggs certainly knows how to present the truth. The little congregation is moving along here very nicely. Have been having good attendance on Lord's Day.—Owen J. Taul.

Kansas—Isaiah said: "There is no judgment in their goings; they have made them crooked paths; whosoever goeth therein shall not know peace." (Isa. 59:8.) May Isaiah 58:12 be applicable to the work that you are engaged in: "And they that shall be of thee shall build the old waste places; thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations; and thou shalt be called the repairer of the breach, the restorer of paths to dwell in." May the Lord give you strength to carry on the work.—Wm. H. Thompson.

Mt. Home, Ark.—For many years I reported in the _____ and sent in subscriptions for it until it strayed aside from the old paths. At the same time I took other papers and sometimes I would report in some of them, but not work for or take any subscriptions for them. Since the M. C. was started I have reported in it and helped it some. But I have decided to give what little help I can and report in the M. C. as long as it remains as it now is, for I consider it the truest to the old Book of any paper I know of now.—W. C. Rice.

Des Moines, Iowa—Since last reporting from here two have been baptized, and one received back into the fellowship of the Church. Our ten meeting started today, June 7th. Bro. W. E. Ballenger doing the preaching, and indications are that we will have a good meeting. We know that Bro. Ballenger will preach the Gospel. We plan for the meetings to continue over five Lord's Days, and we will be pleased to have visiting brethren at any time. Bro. Ballenger's wife and daughter are here to be with us through the meetings, for which we are very glad. I rejoice in the good that the M. C. is doing, and certainly endorse the principles that it is standing for. Let the truth be known.—Eugene Suddeth.

Canada.—I have read with much interest the June issue of the M. C. After reading and re-reading the article by W. C. Ketcherside I wonder how the "boys," C. W. and A. R., can still maintain the Review hasn't changed. It seems A. R. has had a chip on his shoulder for some time, and I'm thinking it's knocked off by Bro. Carl. We've all heard of Goliath. "If the righteous scarcely can be saved, where will the sinner and ungodly appear?" And what of J. C. Roady—will he dare to take up the challenge of Bro. Ketcherside? "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not!" "Then said one unto Him, Lord, are there few that shall be saved? And He said unto them, Strive to enter in at the straight gate; for many I say unto you will seek to enter in, and shall not be able." * * *

Kansas City, Mo.—The church at 26th and Spruce is still getting along fine. Since our last report there have been three more additions to our members—all married people, about middle age, one a man and his wife, he coming from the Evangelical and she from the Christian church, and the others a man whose wife was a member of the church at 26th and Spruce Sts. He also attended our Bible reading while you were with us last winter. He made the good confession and was baptized into Christ. So we still have cause to rejoice, though our hearts are made sad by reason of some who have turned aside after Satan; speaking things they ought not. The Lord rewards them according to their works. We are indeed glad that we shall with them stand before One who will judge the secrets of men's hearts and bring to light the hidden things that are now disrupting the church of our dear Lord, and sowing broadcast the seed of confusion and discord. May the dear Lord have mercy on us all and help us to remember that it is appointed to man once to die and after this the judgment, and help us to examine ourselves whether we be in the faith, for not them that commend themselves are approved, but whom the Lord commendeth. It is an awful thing to fall in the hands of the Living God.—L. L. Ballenger.

St. Louis, Mo.—The church at 7121 Manchester, as well as the new congregation at 5433 Lillian Ave., in the north part of the city, are pressing on in the work. Recently held two weeks' meeting at the new congregation with home talent doing the preaching. Had very good meeting. Four placed membership. The Hartford, Ill., brethren encouraged the work by their attendance. Bro. Huddleston was with us and preached at Manchester in the morning and Lillian in the evening 1st L. D. In June, and Bro. Parker did the same the 2nd L. D. Both of them

gave us wholesome food which builds up the faithful Christian. Was glad to have both of them with us. We welcome such brethren as they who stand firm for the teaching of the old Book and don't hesitate to let it be known. We are very much impressed with the interest the young men are taking in the work at both congregations. We all have more work since starting the new congregation but we know exercise is needful to grow. I enjoy very much the reports and articles in M. C., only I would like to see more. I would like to see reports from all over. Let it be known what you are doing to strengthen the church. You know it's encouraging for us to know we are not alone in the battle for the church. We would be glad to see articles from many of the preaching brethren who are capable writers, such as Carl Ketcherside, William Ketcherside, Bros. Zerr, Roberts and many others. Yours for the same old blood-bought institution, the church.—Robt. Morrow.

Worthington, Mo.—In March I held six nights debate at Morelock church with L. J. Rodgers, Adventist (Bro. Roberts will remember him.) Propositions being the Sabbath and the Lord's day. He tried to follow the debate with a meeting, but could not get a hearing and soon quit and went home. I think we effectually stopped the spread of Adventism in that community. The first Lord's day in June I visited "Klondike" Church in Iowa in an all-day meeting. There were 14 confessions and baptisms and two took membership. Uncle "Bobbie" Lonsford lives there. He is about 84 years old. Most of his descendants down to and including the 4th generation are faithful members of the church. Four generations in the church at the same time. I wonder if that is not very nearly a record on bringing up their children in the "Nurture and admonition of the Lord"? What congregation can beat it? The 2nd Lord's day in June we had all-day meeting here at Worthington; and while threatening weather probably kept some away we had a very nice crowd and a profitable time together. Visiting brethren were present from Bible Grove, Mt. Hope, Martinstown, Unionville and East Concord. The writer spoke at the forenoon service and Bro. A. M. Wiles spoke in the afternoon. Brethren, the time has come that we should arouse ourselves and get to work in earnest. The sects are busy spreading the doctrines and commandments of men. Two things we must do, and the Lord will hold us responsible for it. One is we must preach the gospel wherever and whenever opportunity presents, and the other is the children must be taught and trained in the right way. The recent surrender of a large number of brethren to the enemy makes this all the more imperative. Brethren, our own souls and that of our children and friends are at stake. What are we going to do about it?—J. A. Collins.

Kemp, Illinois—Went into Kentucky and preached at the following places: Began at Free Will Tuesday night and preached there until Lord's Day; had all day meeting. I went from there to Flippin. Preached there from Lord's Day night until Wednesday night, then to Poplar Log, Thursday afternoon and night. At night the house was filled and several had to stand up. I was invited back at each place and expect to return next year for protracted work.—C. R. Turner.

THE GREATEST QUESTION BEFORE THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

It is not whether Roosevelt or Laundon or Thomas or Lenecke will be elected. It is not whether we shall have free trade or a tariff. It is not whether we shall go back to the gold standard or have inflation. It is not whether we shall join the League of Nations or not, or whether we shall have a bigger navy and army. The tax question is important but not the most important, the old age security is great but not the greatest. Political corruption should be handled, but it does not reach the roots of the evils.

None of these questions can be handled satisfactorily unless they are handled by honest men, and it is religion that makes men honest, and they need to be taught this when they are little. **So the greatest problem is the training of the younger generation in the right way.**

In another column of this paper Bro. Collins says: "The time has come that we should arouse ourselves and get to work in earnest. . . . The children must be taught and trained in the right way."

A few days ago a committee made a report in Marion County, Indiana, of which Indianapolis is the center city, on the cause of crime. They had been studying the subject for six years, I think. **Their chief censure was that parents are not teaching their children as they should in moral and religious things.** Very, very true. But if the schools would help a little more than they do, it would help parents who are trying to do something. When religious parents try to keep their children away from the movies where so much evil has been taught, teachers have urged children to attend this or that play. When they have tried to keep their children from dancing, the schools have insisted that they engage in their folk dance, etc., and thus pave the way for something else. But still, with all such disadvantages, we must plod on in our duty.

Can we not, at least two or three times a week, find a quiet hour when we can talk to them, or read to them, of higher and better things than this world can give? The book, "Story of the Bible," by Chas. Foster, is a great book which should be in every home. Nearly a million copies have been sold. My mother read it to me nearly fifty years ago. I read it myself later, and we have worn out several copies with our children. A few days ago a mother who had read the book much, had four copies sent to each of her children now in homes of their own. "First Steps for Little Feet," by the same author, is for very young children.

Let us dig a well deep, in every home, and wall it strong, where the Life-giving Word of God will bubble up, and we can draw it up and can drink often from the "old oaken bucket" of home training, of the Water of Life, so refreshing, so necessary.—D. A. S.

Miscellaneous.—We are sorry that we have to print so much on one subject, but it seems necessary at this time. Why buy new furniture to put into your house, if the house is on fire? First put out the fire. That's what we are trying to do. Brethren, if you will all carry water (but not on both shoulders!), we'll put this fire out! At least, we won't let it burn down the whole building. Let's work. . . . Please have your articles and reports in here by the first of each month. A day or two late makes your report hang over till the next month. . . . Brethren, our progress has been made against bitter and unscrupulous opposition, but we are gaining. Let us rejoice. . . . I am sorry to say that the Simplified New Testament has not yet come from the printers, but we are looking for it at any time. . . . The publisher expects to make a trip to the far west, beginning in September. . . . There are hundreds who need the information which is in the M. C. What are you doing to get it to them? . . . Send 25 cents for a sample of our tracts to distribute. . . . As Bro. Morrow writes in this issue, let's have every church report the good it is doing. And if there are improvements which can be made, report them, too. The New Testament is well filled with commands for improvements.

"Good-bye, God."—Sometimes we see the big denominations put on their big drives on Mother's Day, Father's Day, Children's Day, Easter, and put on their rallies, etc., and we see their big crowds, and we feel that we are not doing anything worth while. Yet perhaps we are making steady progress in the divine life without any worldly flourish. But these big drives are not what they seem. Several months ago I stepped into a great cathedral of the Episcopal church, and as I passed out, I picked up

some of their literature. The "rector" was a little sarcastic when writing to his people, and as our readers go on their vacation they might take the admonition with them. Here is what he said, in part:

"The other day I heard the story of a little girl who was saying her prayers. The family was leaving the next day for a holiday trip of some length. She started with all of her usual petitions and thanksgivings, but ended with the words: 'Good-bye, God, we are going on a vacation tomorrow.' A bit franker than older people, but perhaps not so different, except that the older ones are apt to say that on Easter. Slowly through Lent the congregations grow, until the church is packed for Easter. Then—Bang! The Sunday after Easter is called Low Sunday and it is apt to be pretty low. It isn't merely that a great many who come no other time, crowd the church on Easter, but the slump which follows Easter is almost like the vacation which follows at once the Commencement exercises in a school."

God's way is the best. Every day is Father's Day, and Mother's Day, and Children's Day, and every Lord's Day is Easter. Christians should be taught to be present EVERY Lord's Day, and every other meeting for the advancement of the Cause. "Not forsaking your assembling together," says inspired Paul. Vacation in Christian work is another name for backsliding. "We ought to give the more earnest heed to the things we have heard lest we drift away from them."

VICTORY

O death, where is thy sting, or fear of sod,
Upon this earthly tabernacle form,
When up above the blue, my spirit flees
To wait the final judgment of my God?

O death, where is thy sting, for God be true,
Nor do we grieve to part from those we love,
When joy awaits us there beyond the veil
And Christ, our Refuge, waits to guide us through?

O grave, why dost thou boast of victory?
For there we wait in solemn peaceful sleep—
Just mounds of clay, as whence once we sprung,
Till God doth banish sin and set us free.

O grave, why dost thou boast of victory?
Thou keepest us but a time, nor do we give
Thee praise for what thou know, 'twill be revealed
At God's own time, and Christ is Victory.
—Della Phelps, Nevada, Mo.

There are two kinds of repentance: one is that of Judas, the other that of Peter; the one is ice broken, the other ice melted. Repentance unto life, will be repentance in the life.—Wm. Nevins.

My people have committed two evils: they have forsaken me, the fountain of living waters, and have hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water.—God through Jeremiah.

Woe to them that go down into Egypt for help; and stay on horses, and trust in chariots, because they are many; and in horsemen because they are very strong; but they look not unto the Holy One of Israel, neither seek the Lord!—Isa. 31:1.

O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust.—Paul.